

REMARKS

Claims 1-39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Meyers (5,543,966) in view of Brandt et al. (5,953,147).

Meyers discloses a hybrid refractive and diffractive chromatic lens for single lens cameras. Brandt et al. discloses a flat faced polygonal mirror for a laser imaging system. Independent claims 1, 26, 29 and 33 have been amended to make clear that the present invention is a coated ophthalmic lens with a curved surface. There are, thus, basic differences between the cited art and the claimed invention and a serious question of whether the cited art even constitutes analogous art. However, on the assumption that Meyers and Brandt et al. may be properly considered as prior art, there are numerous additional distinctions relevant here.

Meyers discloses a lens corrected for chromatic aberration by a diffractive rear surface, designed to compensate for the refractive chromatic aberration from the front surface. Contrary to the examiner's suggestion, this lens is not coated - the diffractive side of the lens is formed by modifying the surface to form a diffraction grating. The reflectance from the surface is unrelated to the invention and is mentioned only incidentally where Meyers states that "the diffractive surface acts as an anti-reflection coating." However, no disclosure is made as to the appearance of the reflection. There is no disclosure of "a substantially balanced reflectance from the center to a radius proximate the edge of the lens" as recited in independent claims 1, 26, 29 and 33.

Brandt et al. disclose a mirror for laser imaging with uniform percentage reflectance over a range of angles of incidence. This is different than the claimed invention in several

respects. Firstly, the concept of reducing variation in percentage reflectance as a function of angle of incidence is quite different and conceptually unrelated to reducing variation with position across the recited "curved surface." Secondly, Brandt et al's invention is restricted to the intensity, i.e. percentage of reflectance at a single monochromatic wavelength, whereas the present invention relates to a coating that exhibits a substantially balanced reflectance when inspected visually, with a polychromatic white light source, with the reflectance being substantially balanced in terms of visual appearance.

In summary, Meyers and Brandt et al. are unrelated to the essentially claimed invention and each other.

The Examiner has implied that the term "substantially balanced reflectance" is indefinite. This is not believed to be the case. The term is explicitly defined at page 3, lines 24-30 of the specification as follows:

By the term "substantially balanced reflectance" we mean that where the thickness of the coating varies across the surface of the lens, the lightness, hue and chroma of the reflectance vary in a balanced manner such that variations in visual appearance are either imperceptible or generally acceptable to an observer. For example, variations in chromatic attributes, such as hue, from the center to the edge of the lens may be balanced by a reduction in lightness from the center to the edge.

Accordingly, the claims are believed to be allowable over the cited references. If any minor matter remains to be resolved after consideration of this amendment, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney by telephone to expedite issuance.

Respectfully submitted,

BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.

By: 

Samuel C. Miller
Registration No. 27,360

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404
(703) 836-6620

Date: April 30, 2003

Attachment to Amendment dated April 30, 2003

Marked-up Claims 1, 26, 29, 33 and 35

1. (Amended) A coated optical lens including
[a] an ophthalmic lens element; and
a coating on a curved surface of the lens element exhibiting a substantially
balanced reflectance from the [centre] center to a radius proximate the edge of the lens
element.

26. (Amended) A multi-coated optical lens including
[a] an ophthalmic lens element,
a coating on a curved surface of the lens element exhibiting a substantially
balanced reflectance from the [centre] center to a radius proximate the edge of the lens
element; and

[one or more] at least one secondary [coatings] coating which [provide]
provides at least one of a desirable optical, [and/or] chemical, [and/or] or mechanical
property to the optical article.

29. (Amended) A multi-coated optical lens including
[a] an ophthalmic lens element;
a first coating on the front surface of the lens element; and

Attachment to Amendment dated April 30, 2003

Marked-up Claims 1, 26, 29, 33 and 35

a secondary coating on the back surface of the lens element; the first and second coatings in combination exhibiting a substantially balanced reflectance from the [centre] center to a radius proximate the edge of the lens element.

33. (Amended) A method for preparing a coated optical lens, which method includes providing

[a] an ophthalmic lens element with a curved surface; and

a coating exhibiting a substantially balanced reflectance from the [centre] center to a radius proximate the edge of the lens element; and depositing the coating on [a] the curved surface of the lens element.

35. (Amended) A method according to claim 33 which method further includes providing

[a lens element,]

a high refractive index material, and

a low refractive index material;

depositing overlapping layers of high and low refractive index material on [a] the curved surface of the lens element, wherein the thickness and/or number of the respective layers are selected to balance the variation of any combination of reflected lightness, hue and chroma.
